

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This amendment is responsive to the Final Office Action of November 4, 2003. Claims 10-16 are pending in the application. By this amendment, claim 13 is being amended and claim 16 is being canceled. No new matter is involved.

On page 2 of the Final Office Action, claims 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by Kato et al. In response, Applicant is amending claim 13 to add the limitations of claim 16 thereto, with claim 16 being canceled in view thereof. As so amended, claim 13, and claims 14-15 which depend therefrom, are submitted to clearly distinguish patentably over Kato et al.

The final Office Action appears to focus on the double-gate TFT, shown as 10A in Fig. 6 of Kato. The Office Action maintains that the structure of this TFT is identical with the structure defined in claim 16 of this application. However, the current path in the semiconductor layer 3 of the double-gate TFT of Kato extends in the direction from the contact region between the column electrode line 8 and the semiconductor layer 3 toward the contact region between the pixel electrode 5a toward the semiconductor layer 3 (or the opposite direction thereof). It therefore extends along the horizontal direction on the page of Fig. 6. A channel region is formed at a position which overlaps the region where the gate electrode of the semiconductor layer 3 is formed. Accordingly, the two channel regions of the TFT 10A in Fig. 6 of Kato are arranged side-by-side in the horizontal direction, which is electrically "serial" and not "parallel" with respect to the current path.

As amended herein, claim 13 now recites the channel areas as being "connected in parallel with respect to a current path". Accordingly, claim 13 is submitted to clearly distinguish patentably over the art.

Claims 14 and 15 depend from and contain all of the limitations of claim 13, so that such claims are also submitted to clearly distinguish patentably over the art.

Appl. No. 09/927,794  
Amdt. Dated May 4, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of March 14, 2003

Attorney Docket No. 81784.0241  
Customer No.: 26021

On page 2 of the final Office Action, claims 10-12 are said to be allowed.

On December 23, 2003, an Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) was filed in connection with U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/148,606. Applicant is enclosing an IDS to make such references of record in this application.

In conclusion, claims 10-15 remain in the application. Claims 10-12 have been allowed, and claims 13-15 are submitted to clearly distinguish patentably over the art for the reasons discussed above. Therefore, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California telephone number (213) 337-6846 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,  
HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

Date: May 4, 2004

By: 

John P. Scherlacher  
Registration No. 23,009  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

500 South Grand Avenue, Suite 1900  
Los Angeles, California 90071  
Phone: 213-337-6700  
Fax: 213-337-6701